

Submission of Formal Drawings:

A full set of replacement formal drawings are being submitted with this document, whereby they include the proposed drawing changes made to Figures 15(A) and 15(B) in the previously filed reply.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled, added or amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-16 remain pending in this application.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 14 Under 34 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph:

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, since “this subject matter (process steps) is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, please note page 28, line 18 to page 29, line 12 of the specification, which provides full support for the features that were added to claims 4 and 14. Also, please note the example described on page 29, line 13 to page 30, line 11 of the specification, which provides additional description of these features.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 4 and 14 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,067,548 to Cheng. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action asserts that Figure 9 of Cheng shows an example of the claimed stored information relationship of a triple set/level. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Figure 9 of Cheng shows a relationship graph in an OMM front-end tool, in which two different relationships are illustrated, with a division name at the top position, and a

sub_group relationship at the bottom (and with a name in the middle). See column 12, line 66 to column 12, line 7 of Cheng.

With all due respect, this relationship of information in an OMM front-end tool says nothing about the storing of information as a triple-set of division information, item information and content in a storing unit. Rather, it appears that the information shown in the different boxes in Figure 9 of Cheng is stored in separate locations, with pointers to relate information in one storage location with information in another storage location.

Accordingly, Cheng does not anticipate claim 1. As independent claim 13 recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, that claim is also not anticipated by Cheng.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 4 and 14, those claims recite, among other things:

acquiring unevaluated customizing information from the customizing information storing unit;

performing an inspection as to whether or not the customizing condition is established; and

if the customizing condition is established, adding the unevaluated customizing information to a personal environment of the user.

The Office Action asserts that columns 8 and 9 of Cheng teach the above-highlighted features of claims 4 and 14, but this assertion is incorrect. The fact that Cheng establishes virtual links based on owner/user ID information falls well short of the specific features mentioned above in claims 4 and 14. That is, Cheng fails to disclose or suggest a step of performing an inspection as to whether or not the customizing condition is established, and Cheng fails to disclose or suggest that, if the customizing condition is established, adding the unevaluated customizing information to a personal environment of a user.

Accordingly, claims 4 and 14 are patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 8, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819